Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15 and 17 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

Claims 7, 15 and 17 have been objected to because of various informalities. Applicants submit that the claims have been amended to appear in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-9 and 16-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Christiansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,787,264). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Christiansen.

Christiansen discloses a computer system that arbitrates control of a shared bus among plural devices included in the computer system. See Christiansen at col. 2, ll. 60-65. The computer system includes a request line 28 and a grant line 30. A bus master device of second priority has an arbitration critical line (ARBcrit) connected to an arbiter 22. A bus master device of second priority wants control of or access to the system bus, the bus master device of second priority asserts its request line as well as the ARBcrit line. Upon receiving the request and ARBcrit signals, the arbiter then grants control of the bus to the bus master device of second priority without regard to the equal access arbitration scheme (col. 6, ll. 22-33). However, Christiansen does not disclose a point to point half duplex interface coupled to an agent.

Claim 1 recites:

> A computer system comprising:
> a first agent;
> a point to point half duplex interface coupled to the first agent; and
> a second agent, coupled to the point to point half duplex interface, to transmit a signal to the first agent via a first component of the interface indicating the type of access of the interface the second agent is

requesting, and the first agent to transmit a signal to the second agent via the first component of the interface indicating the type of access of the interface the first agent is requesting.

As discussed above, Christiansen does not disclose a point to point half duplex interface. Moreover, Christiansen does not disclose a second agent to transmit a signal to a first agent via a first component of an interface indicating the type of access of the interface the second agent is requesting, and the first agent to transmit a signal to the second agent via the first component of the interface indicating the type of access of the interface the first agent is requesting. Therefore, the present claims are patentable over Christiansen.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. Thus, claims 2-9 are also patentable over Christiansen.

Claim 16 recites

A method comprising:
a first agent requesting a critical access to a point to point half duplex interface;
determining whether a second agent has control of the interface;
if so, asserting a preempt component of the interface at the first agent; and
waiting for control of the interface to be granted to the first agent.

Accordingly, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 16 is also patentable over Christiansen. Since claims 17-25 depend from claim 16 and include additional limitations, claims 17-25 are also patentable over Christiansen.

Claims 2 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ajanovic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,145,039) in view of Christiansen. In response, applicant respectfully submits that reliance on Ajanovic for a 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection is inappropriate.

Section 103(c) of Title 35 of the United States Code was amended in November 1999 to include references, which qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C §102(e). Section 103(c) currently reads:

> *Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of the subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.*

Ajanovic is considered prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because it was filed before the present application (effective filing date: 11-3-98), but was issued after the filing of the application. Additionally, at the time of conception of the claimed invention, Ajanovic, as well as the claimed invention, was subject to an obligation of assignment, and commonly owned by the Intel Corporation of Santa Clara, California. Therefore, due to the §102(e) status of the cited references, and in light of §103(c), Ajanovic cannot be used as a reference to preclude patentability of claims 2 and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C §103.

Moreover, the claims are patentable over Christiansen. Christiansen does not contain all of the elements needed to disclose the claimed present invention. Therefore, the present claims are patentable over Christiansen. Applicants therefore request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Ajanovic and Christiansen.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9/29/03

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980